DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 083 260 TM 003 221

AUTHOR	Hough, Leaetta M.; Hellervik, Lowell W.
TITLE	An Interim Evaluation of the Burroughs-Clinton Busing Program; Minneapolis Public Schools.
INSTITUTION	Minneapolis Public Schools, Minn. Dept. of Research and Evaluation.
PUB DATE	Apr 72
NOTE	15p.; DIR-1
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	Academic Achievement; Attendance Patterns; *Bus Transportation; *Elementary Schools; *Formative Evaluation; *Integration Methods; Parent Attitudes; Racial Integration; School Buses; School Environment; *School Integration; Student Attitudes; Teacher Attitudes

ABSTRACT

In the Fall of 1970, a voluntary, one-way busing program of 59 white students was initiated from the Burroughs Elementary School Area to the Clinton Elementary School. An independent research agency was contracted to evaluate the program. Areas being investigated are attitudes of parents, teachers and students; school attendance; school climate; and scholastic achievement. Results thus far are generally favorable, although some negative effects are suggested. Among the positive findings are the parents' reports that their children like school more, increased school involvement of parents, enthusiasm for the project by the parents and teachers, and improved attendance for both bused and nonbused students. Negative findings suggest that bused students were a less cohesive group than nonbused students, perhaps attended a more "competitive" school, felt more friction existed at school than did nonbused Burroughs students, and perhaps were less satisfied than nonbused Burroughs students. Some of these negative findings were inconsistent with results from parent and teacher interviews. Some of the inconsistency may be due to the use of the nonbused Burroughs students as a comparison group, which assumes that prior to the busing program, the bused students were no different from the nonbused Burroughs sample. If this assumption is wrong, the results of the questionnaire comparisons are not valid. Scholastic achievement data were not available. (Author/KM)

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

ED 083260

TM 003 221

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Minneapolis Public Schools

An Interim Evaluation of the Burroughs-Clinton Busing Program

by

Leaetta M. Hough
and
Lowell W. Hellervik
Personnel Decisions, Inc.
Minneapolis, Minnesota

Ideas expressed in this report do not necessarily reflect the official position of the Minneapolis Public School Administration nor the Minneapolis School Board.

April 1972

Research and Evaluation Department
Educational Services Division

Minneapolis Public Schools

An Interim Evaluation of the Burroughs-Clinton Busing Program

Summary

In the Fall of 1970 a voluntary, one-way busing program of 59 white students was initiated from the Burroughs Elementary School area to Clinton Elementary School to provide a more integrated education for these students. Clinton had over 40 percent minority students while Burroughs had less than one percent. See page 1

An independent research agency, Personnel Decisions, Inc., was contracted to provide an evaluation of the program. Areas being investigated are attitudes of parents, teachers and students, school attendance, school climate, and scholastic achievement.

Results thus far are generally favorable although some negative effects are suggested. Among the positive findings are the parents' reports that their children like school more, increased school involvement of parents, enthusiasm for the project by the parents and teachers, and improved attendance for both bused and nonbused students. See pages 1 - 3

Negative findings suggest that bused students were a less cohesive group than nonbused students, perhaps attended a more "competitive" school, felt more friction existed at school than did nonbused Burroughs students, and perhaps were less satisfied than nonbused Burroughs students. See pages 6 - 11

Some of these negative findings were inconsistent with results obtained from parent and teacher interviews. Some of this inconsistency may be due to the use of the nonbused Burroughs students as a comparison group. The use of this comparison group assumes that prior to the busing program, the bused students were no different from the nonbused Burroughs sample. This assumption may be wrong. If it is, then results of the questionnaire comparisons on both Clinton and bused students with the Burroughs students are not valid. See pages 11 - 12

Scholastic achievement data were not yet available for the interim report, but will be included in the final report.

* * *

Research and Evaluation Department
Educational Services Division

April 1972

Contents

	Page
Introduction.	1
Methodology	1
Parental Attitudes	1
Attendance Data	2
Attitudes of Teachers	2
School Climate.	3
Student Attitudes	6
Summary	11

Introduction

Recently two Minneapolis Elementary Schools became involved in a one-way voluntary busing program to achieve a more integrated education for the students at Clinton Elementary School. Though both schools are racially imbalanced, Burroughs' minority population is only one percent whereas 20 percent of the students at Clinton are American Indian and another 20 percent of the Clinton students are black, busing at present is into the Inner City school, Clinton. In the fall of 1970, 59 students from Burroughs and the surrounding area started attending classes at Clinton Elementary School. In the spring of 1971, Personnel Decisions, Inc. proposed a program to evaluate the effects of the busing program.

Methodology

The areas that have been and are currently being investigated by Personnel Decisions, Inc. in the Burroughs-Clinton Busing Program are parental attitudes, teacher attitudes, student attitudes, school attendance, school climate, and scholastic achievement. All the data have been collected, with the exception of the scholastic data. Some Clinton students have not yet completed the achievement tests, and since we were unaware that the scholastic tests are administered at times that are convenient for the particular schools, we have been unable to complete the final report at this date. The final report will be a complete documentation of our evaluation of the Burroughs-Clinton Busing Program. This interim report will summarize the results of the data that have been analyzed thus far.

Parental Attitudes

Twenty-two of the 32 parents whose children were bused into Clinton were interviewed in their homes for 30 to 45 minutes. Content analysis of those interviews indicated that the parents felt very positive about the busing program. Not only did they feel that voluntary busing is a viable solution to integrating the schools, but they also felt that the busing experience had a positive effect on their children. For example, the parents felt their children had a more positive attitude toward school. They reported that the children "really looked forward to school each day," and that this increased liking and interest in school reduced the need for parental encouragement for attending school. Most of the students liked the bus ride and many of them had no other way of getting to Clinton other than by the bus. Some of the parents felt that this motivated the students to become more responsible about getting ready for school on time.

Parents felt that Clinton Elementary School was more relaxed and personal than the schools at which their children had previously been registered. They felt their children thought "learning was fun at Clinton." Some of the parents thought there was less competition among students at Clinton, because of the flexible scheduling,[1] and because of the overall relaxed climate at Clinton.

Parents felt their children were somewhat more physical than previously. They were uncertain whether this was due to maturation or the busing

---

[1]For each subject, a student studies with other children who perform at approximately the same level.

experience. The parents, however, did not feel this had led to disciplinary problems. Some parents felt that whatever undesirable behavior had been learned, had been learned from other bus students during the bus ride.

The parents themselves felt their attitude toward school had become more positive. They were more active and interested in school events. They reported that the relationships with the personnel at Clinton were more free and open. There were no social barriers; in fact, they were encouraged to visit the school and the teachers at any time.

Attendance Data

The attendance data support the parents' perceptions that the children liked school. During 1969-70, the attendance rate

$$\left(\frac{\text{average number of days attended by the bused students}}{\text{total number of school days}}\right)$$

for the bused students was 94.8%. Each bused student missed an average of 8.7 days during 1969-70. However, during 1970-71, each bused student missed only an average of 5.8 days. During the year the students were bused, they attended school 96.8% of the time--significantly more often ($p < .002$) than they had the previous year.

The students indigenous to the Clinton area also attended significantly more school ($p < .002$) during 1970-71, the year that children were being bused into Clinton. During 1969-70, the indigenous students attended an average of 91.3% of the possible school days. During 1970-71, however, they attended class 93.7% of the time; i.e., each indigenous student attended an average of 3.1 days a year more than he/she had attended the previous year. Though it is difficult to infer causation from this evidence, it seems that the students enjoyed school at Clinton. A more cautious interpretation is that at least the students did not attend less school as a result of the busing program.

Attitudes of Teachers

The teachers at both Clinton and Burroughs were interviewed about their attitudes toward school and their perceptions of the busing program. The teachers at Burroughs felt that no change had occurred at Burroughs as a result of the busing program. Even though they described most of the bused students as being good students and "ones that a teacher likes to have in class," they said that only one or two students from a class had left Burroughs to be bused into Clinton and this was an insignificant number in relation to the entire class.[2]

The Clinton teachers felt that the busing program was running smoothly. There had been no adverse effects upon anyone concerned. They felt that the students had mixed well with each other--"You couldn't tell a

[2]Only 68% of the students in the busing program, or 40 students, were from Burroughs. The remainder of students were from the surrounding area.

bused student from a non-bused student." They felt that the bused students were a positive influence on the indigenous Clinton students. In their opinion, several of the bused students were success models--academically and socially, for the indigenous Clinton students. Some teachers felt classroom behavior had improved and speculated that, it was partially a result of the more academically oriented bused students' desire to listen and learn, and their applying pressure on their nonattentive friends to listen to the teacher. The teachers also felt that this peer pressure was successful only because the students were friends.

The teachers also felt that the playground behavior had improved. However, the cause of the change is difficult to determine. Other programs and ideas were implemented in Clinton during 1970-71, and it is difficult to ascertain what influenced what.

School Climate

The "Preferred Qualities of Students" questionnaire also was administered to both the Clinton and Burroughs teachers. The mean rankings by the Clinton teachers are listed in Tables 1 and 2 below. The mean rankings by the Burroughs teachers are listed in Tables 3 and 4.

TABLE 1

CLINTON TEACHERS' MEAN RANKINGS OF PREFERRED QUALITIES FOR BOYS*
(N=14)**

Quality	Mean Ranking***
Responsible and Trustworthy	3.1
Assertive and Self-reliant	3.4
Interacts Well with Others	3.9
Curious	4.6
Considerate and Cooperative	5.3
Able to Make Friends	5.3
Imaginative and Carefree	6.1
Respectful Toward Adults	6.8
Fun Loving and Carefree	7.5
Neat and Clean	9.0

* This information was obtained from the "Preferred Qualities of Students" questionnaire developed by John Hurley at Michigan State University.

** 63.6 percent of the teachers at Clinton completed the questionnaire.

*** The ten qualities are ranked by teachers by assigning the most important dimension a "1" and the least important dimension a "10." The intervening dimensions are each assigned a different number, i.e., no ties are allowed on the individual rankings.

TABLE 2

CLINTON TEACHERS' MEAN RANKINGS OF PREFERRED QUALITIES FOR GIRLS*
(N=14)**

Quality	Mean Ranking***
Responsible and Trustworthy	3.1
Interacts Well with Others	3.6
Assertive and Self-reliant	4.0
Considerate and Cooperative	4.9
Able to Make Friends	5.2
Curious	5.4
Imaginative and Carefree	5.8
Respectful Toward Adults	7.1
Fun Loving and Carefree	7.7
Neat and Clean	8.3

* This information was obtained from the "Preferred Qualities of Students" questionnaire developed by John Hurley.
** 63.6 percent of the teachers at Clinton completed the questionnaire.
*** Teachers ranked the qualities "1" through "10," "1" being the most important quality and "10" the least important.

TABLE 3

BURROUGHS TEACHERS' MEAN RANKINGS OF PREFERRED QUALITIES FOR BOYS*
(N=22)**

Quality	Mean Ranking***
Curious	2.8
Interacts Well with Others	3.1
Responsible and Trustworthy	3.5
Considerate and Cooperative	4.2
Assertive and Self-reliant	5.1
Able to Make Friends	5.4
Imaginative and Carefree	6.0
Respectful Toward Adults	7.3
Fun Loving and Carefree	8.4
Neat and Clean	9.3

* This information was obtained from the "Preferred Qualities of Students" questionnaire.
** 73.3 percent of the teachers at Burroughs completed the questionnaire.
*** Teachers ranked the qualities "1" through "10," "1" being the most important quality and "10" the least important quality.

TABLE 4

BURROUGHS TEACHERS' MEAN RANKINGS OF PREFERRED QUALITIES FOR GIRLS*
(N=22)**

Quality	Mean Ranking***
Curious	2.9
Interacts Well with Others	3.0
Responsible and Trustworthy	3.6
Considerate and Cooperative	4.5
Assertive and Self-reliant	5.0
Able to Make Friends	5.2
Imaginative and Carefree	5.8
Respectful Toward Adults	7.5
Fun Loving and Carefree	8.4
Neat and Clean	9.1

* This information was obtained from the "Preferred Qualities of Students" questionnaire.
** 73.3 percent of the teachers at Burroughs completed the questionnaire.
*** Teachers ranked the qualities "1" through "10," "1" being the most important quality and "10" being the least important quality.

A 2 X 2 analysis of variance, computed for each dimension, indicated that Clinton teachers ranked "Curious" significantly higher (less important) than did Burroughs teachers, and Clinton teachers ranked "Assertive and Self-reliant" significantly lower (more important) than did Burroughs teachers. Perhaps the Clinton teachers responded to the environment at Clinton which they perceived as requiring more aggressiveness and assertive behavior to adapt to the situations or life in the inner city, and consequently felt those behaviors were more important than did the Burroughs teachers. This interpretation does seem justified because upon close inspection: 1) Clinton teachers thought Assertiveness and Self-reliance were more important for boys than for girls (though the contrast was not significant); 2) compared with Burroughs teachers, Clinton teachers thought Assertiveness and Self-reliance were more important (statistically significant) for boys; and, 3) Clinton and Burroughs teachers did not rank "Assertive and Self-reliant" significantly different for girls. (The mean rankings are: for Clinton boys, 3.4; for Clinton girls, 4.0; for Burroughs girls, 5.0; and for Burroughs boys, 5.1.) The Clinton teachers did differentiate what was important, in their opinion, for boys from that which was important for girls. They thought that aggressive and self-reliant behavior was more important for boys than for girls, and as mentioned earlier, this may be a result of their perceiving these behaviors to be more adaptive for boys than for girls in their particular environment. This discussion, then, suggests, that based upon the differences in

teachers' rankings, there are some differences in climate at the two schools.

Curiosity is another dimension in which teachers differed significantly in their rankings. Perhaps this too reflects a difference in climate between the two schools.

The comparison between preferences of teachers at Clinton and preferences of teachers at Burroughs does not indicate whether any change has occurred at Clinton or Burroughs as a result of the busing. However, the data does suggest that the bused students attended classes (at Clinton) which had a slightly different environment than the environment at Burroughs. The climate at Clinton was characterized by a preference for students that are responsible, trustworthy, assertive, and self-reliant. The climate at Burroughs, however, was characterized by a preference for curious students.

The "School Survey" was also administered to the teachers at both elementary schools to determine the climates of the schools. These questionnaires are analyzed at the Industrial Relations Center at the University of Chicago, and we have not yet received their analyses.

Student Attitudes

Students at Clinton and Burroughs elementary schools completed the "My Class" questionnaire so that the children's perceptions of their respective schools could be determined. The Clinton school was the main unit to be evaluated, and consequently as many students as possible completed the "My Class" questionnaire. This resulted in a sample that contained 70 percent of the indigenous student population at Clinton and 65 percent of the bused students. A different strategy was utilized to obtain the Burroughs sample. The sample size did not need to be as large, and consequently classes at Burroughs were randomly selected until approximately 15 percent of the students were included in the sample. The students in the randomly selected classes completed the "My Class" questionnaire, resulting in a sample that was 12 percent of the entire student body.

Based upon their responses to the questionnaire, students received scores on the following five dimensions: cohesiveness, friction, difficulty, satisfaction, competitiveness. Students were divided into three groups: Burroughs students, bused Clinton students, and indigenous Clinton students. Means were calculated for each group on each of the dimensions and then, using a t statistic, each mean for each dimension was compared with each of the other means in that dimension. For example, the mean score for Burroughs students on the friction dimension was compared with the mean score for the bused students on the friction dimension. A second comparison was computed between the mean scores for the Burroughs students on the friction

dimension and the mean score for the Clinton students on the friction dimension. A third comparison on the friction dimension was between the mean score of the bused students and the mean score of the Clinton students. Similar comparisons were calculated using the t statistic for each of the other dimensions.

The results for the "cohesiveness" dimension are shown in Table 5.

TABLE 5

DESCRIPTIVE AND INFERENTIAL STATISTICS FOR THE COHESIVENESS DIMENSION ON THE "MY CLASS" QUESTIONNAIRE

Comparison Group	Sample Size	Standard Deviation	Mean	Value of t Statistic
Clinton vs.	162	3.80	20.64	
Burroughs	89	3.09	20.57	.149
Clinton vs.	162	3.80	20.64	
Clinton (bused)	44	2.98	18.93	2.758*
Burroughs vs.	89	3.09	20.57	
Clinton (bused)	44	2.98	18.93	2.913*

* Significant at .01 level of confidence

NOTE: A high mean score indicates a feeling of cohesiveness.

The bused group of students was significantly less cohesive than either of the Clinton or Burroughs student groups. This seems to be a result of the busing experience because the students at the school from which the bused students came, Burroughs, and the students at the school to which they were bused, Clinton, were equally cohesive. The bused students were less intimate and less cohesive than were the other students. The bused students seemed to sense that they did not quite belong to the new group. Perhaps this feeling was partially a function of the short period of time in which the bused students had interacted with the Clinton students. Another possible explanation is that the bused students had friends in both schools and, consequently, their playmates during the summer, after school, and during school, may have been different people. This increase of friends in different settings may have led to a decrease in their feeling of cohesiveness and identification with any one group.

The results for the "difficulty" dimension are shown below in Table 6.

TABLE 6

DESCRIPTIVE AND INFERENTIAL STATISTICS FOR THE DIFFICULTY DIMENSION ON THE "MY CLASS" QUESTIONNAIRE

Comparison Group	Sample Size	Standard Deviation	Mean	Value of t Statistic
Clinton vs.	161	3.51	17.50	
Burroughs	90	2.97	15.74	4.018*
Clinton vs.	161	3.51	17.50	
Clinton (bused)	44	3.00	15.95	2.668*
Burroughs vs.	90	2.97	15.74	
Clinton (bused)	44	3.00	15.95	-.383

* Significant at .01 level of confidence

NOTE: A high score indicates that students feel school is difficult.

The Clinton students felt that school was more difficult compared to how difficult the Burroughs students and the bused students felt school was. (Both the comparisons, Clinton vs. Burroughs and Clinton vs. Clinton bused, are significant.) There is no difference, however, between how difficult the Burroughs students and the bused students felt school was. Consequently, assuming that the intelligence level of the bused students was no different from the intelligence level of the Burroughs students, there probably was no difference in the level of difficulty at the two schools. The difference was probably perceptual rather than real.

The results for the "competitiveness" dimension are shown below in Table 7.

TABLE 7

DESCRIPTIVE AND INFERENTIAL STATISTICS FOR THE COMPETITIVENESS DIMENSION ON THE "MY CLASS" QUESTIONNAIRE

Comparison Group	Sample Size	Standard Deviation	Mean	Value of t Statistic
Clinton vs. Burroughs	168 88	3.59 3.91	21.32 19.88	2.957*
Clinton vs. Clinton (bused)	168 45	3.59 4.14	21.32 20.47	1.364
Burroughs vs. Clinton (bused)	88 45	3.91 4.14	19.88 20.47	-.807

* Significant at .01 level of confidence

NOTE: A high mean score indicates a feeling of competitiveness.

On the "competitiveness" scale Clinton students felt their school was more competitive (significant at .05) than the Burroughs students felt their school was. However, the bused students felt Clinton was less competitive (though not statistically significant) than did the indigenous Clinton students. The bused students also felt that Clinton was more competitive (though not statistically significant) than the Burroughs students felt their school was. These findings contradict some of the results based on the interviews with the parents. As reported earlier, some of the parents commented that Clinton was less competitive and more relaxed than the schools which their children had previously attended. Some possible explanations of this contradiction are: 1) scores on the "competitiveness" dimension of the "My Class" questionnaire are unreliable[3] and consequently not valid; 2) those parents who commented on the less competitive atmosphere at Clinton were parents whose children had not attended Burroughs the previous year[4]; and/or, 3) parents were referring to teacher behavior rather than actual student behavior, whereas the questionnaire is directed

[3]The test-retest reliability coefficients for the scales on the "My Class" questionnaire are: competitiveness, .56; satisfaction, .77; friction, .70; difficulty, .56; and cohesiveness, .54.

[4]Only 68% of the bused students were initially Burroughs students. Consequently, it is possible that those parents commenting on the less competitive environment at Clinton had children who had attended schools other than Burroughs the previous year. There is no way of knowing if this is the correct explanation of the apparent contradiction in findings since the interviews were confidential, i.e., no names were associated with responses.

more toward peer-induced competition, i.e., parents may have been referring to teachers at Clinton not emphasizing or reinforcing competitive interaction between students rather than actual competition between students.

The results for the "friction" dimension are shown below in Table 8.

TABLE 8

DESCRIPTIVE AND INFERENTIAL STATISTICS FOR THE FRICTION DIMENSION ON THE "MY CLASS" QUESTIONNAIRE

Comparison Group	Sample Size	Standard Deviation	Mean	Value of t Statistic
Clinton vs.	171	3.59	22.01	
Burroughs	90	3.21	19.87	4.745**
Clinton vs.	171	3.59	22.01	
Clinton (bused)	45	3.44	21.29	1.208
Burroughs vs.	90	3.21	19.87	
Clinton (bused)	45	3.44	21.29	-2.367*

* Significant at .05 level of confidence
** Significant at .01 level of confidence

NOTE: A high mean score indicates a feeling of friction.

Both the bused and indigenous Clinton students felt that more friction (statistically significant) existed at Clinton than did Burroughs students feel existed at Burroughs. Though indigenous Clinton students felt more friction existed at Clinton than did the bused students, the difference is not statistically significant. These results may be partially explained by looking at the individual items within the scale. Typical questions are, for example, "Many children in our class like to fight," and "Some pupils don't like other pupils." Most of the other items in the scale are variations of these two examples. If students infer that fighting refers to physical fighting, then, a group of students who tend to settle disagreements physically will have a higher mean score than a group of students who tend to settle their disagreements in other ways. It may be that the Clinton students and Burroughs students differed only in the way that they responded to the subset of questions which referred to fighting.

This interpretation fits with the statements made by parents that some of the children were more physical than they had been the previous year. If the instrument does indicate that the indigenous Clinton students were more physical than Burroughs students, then there is some evidence that it was, at least, possible for some bused students to have learned

physical ways of expressing themselves from the indigenous Clinton students. This, however, neither contradicts nor supports the teachers' statements that the indigenous Clinton students are less physical than they were prior to the busing program.

The results for the "satisfaction" dimension are shown in Table 9.

TABLE 9

DESCRIPTIVE AND INFERENTIAL STATISTICS FOR THE SATISFACTION DIMENSION ON THE "MY CLASS" QUESTIONNAIRE

Comparison Group	Sample Size	Standard Deviation	Mean	Value of t Statistic
Clinton vs.	164	4.55	18.82	
Burroughs	88	4.02	22.09	-5.657*
Clinton vs.	164	4.55	18.82	
Clinton (bused)	43	4.37	18.09	.944
Burroughs vs.	88	4.02	22.09	
Clinton (bused)	43	4.37	18.09	5.188*

* Significant at .01 level of confidence

NOTE: A high mean score indicates a high level of satisfaction.

The Burroughs students were more satisfied (statistically significant) than both the bused and indigenous Clinton students. The bused and indigenous Clinton students were about equally satisfied. These findings contradict the results of the teacher and parent interview data. Parents said that the children liked school more than they had the previous year. The teachers also said that the students liked school very much. Nor does the attendance data appear to support the finding that bused students were less satisfied than Burroughs students. Since measures on the satisfaction scale were not obtained prior to the busing experience, it is possible that those students who were in the busing program would have scored even lower on the satisfaction scale prior to the busing experience than they scored on the satisfaction scale after the busing experience. In other words, perhaps the parents, teachers, and the mean score on the satisfaction scale are correct; i.e., Burroughs students were more satisfied than Clinton students and the bused students were more satisfied with school than they had been the previous year.

Summary

The results analyzed thus far indicate that the busing program has been successful. Among the positive findings are the parents' reports of

their children liking school more, increased school involvement of the parents, enthusiasm for the project by parents and teachers, and the increased class attendance for both bused and indigenous students. The negative findings come from the "My Class" questionnaire. The scores on that test indicate that bused students were less cohesive than the other two groups, perhaps attended a more competitive school, felt more friction existed at school than did Burroughs students, and perhaps were less satisfied than Burroughs students. Some of these negative findings are not consistent with results of the parent and teacher interviews. To use Burroughs for comparison assumes that prior to the busing program the bused students as a group were no different from the Burroughs sample. This assumption is not necessarily justified and, if it is not, then the results of the comparisons of both indigenous and bused Clinton students with Burroughs students on the "My Class" questionnaire are not valid.